REMARKS

Specification Amendments

Paragraph 0072 is amended to add the SEQ ID NOS. 1 through 4 corresponding to the mouse NGAL sense primer, the mouse NGAL antisense primer, the human NGAL sense primer, and the human NGAL antisense primer, respectively, as required by the Examiner.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-11, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55, and 60-65 were in the application.

Claims 1, 30, 31, 48, 52 and 61-65 are now canceled by this amendment without prejudice. New independent Claim 66 is added. Claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 33, 35, 37, 55 and 60 are now amended to change dependency and correct antecedent basis to the new Claim 66.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11, 33, 35, 37, 55, 60 and 66 are now subject to examination.

New independent Claim 66 is based on Claim 1 as originally filed, wherein the renal tubular cell injury (RTCI) is selected from an ischemic renal injury; to provide that the urine sample is obtained within four hours of the RTCI [e.g., express support in para. 0051]; to provide that the mammal is suspected of having the RTCI [e.g., implicit support throughout the description and figures, including in para. 0037 and 0043]; and to provide "correlating the level of detected antibody-NGAL complex to the mammal having the RTCI [e.g., express support in para. 0043].

Claims 2, 4, 5, and 9 are amended to change claim dependency to new Claim 66 and to correct antecedent basis.

Claim 33 is amended to change claim dependency, to correct antecedent basis to the mammal, and to provide that the urine sample is obtained immediately after the onset of the RTCI [e.g., express support in para. 0039].

Claim 35 is amended to change claim dependency, and to provide that the urine sample is obtained within a period of time of the RTCI, the period of time selected from the group consisting of 2 hours, 1 hour, and 30 minutes. [e.g., express support in para. 0051].

Claim 37 is amended to change claim dependency, and to provide that the RTCI is effected by an event upon the mammal, the event selected from the group consisting of: (a) a

surgical procedure selected from the group consisting of open heart surgery, cardiac surgery, and vascular surgery; and (b) kidney transplantation. [e.g., express support in paras. 0038 and 0042].

Claim 55 is amended to change claim dependency, and to provide that the level of detected antibody- NGAL complex correlates with the extent of the acute ischemic renal tubular cell injury. [e.g., express support in para. 0043].

Claim 60 is amended to change claim dependency, and to provide that the mammal is a patient who has undergone open heart surgery, and wherein an at least 10-fold increase in the level of antibody-NGAL complex in a urine sample obtained at 2 hours, correlates with the RTCI progressing to acute renal failure (ARF). [e.g., express support is found in para. 0101]

Applicants believe the amendments to the claims find full support in the specification, and that no additional claim fees are due.

Priority (Page 3 of the Action)

The Examiner has denied Applicants' claim for benefit of prior-filed U.S. Provisional Application Nos. 60/458,143 and 60/481,596, for failing to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by first paragraph of 35 USC 112, for one or more claims of the present application.

Applicants expressly disagree with the Examiner's analyses, rationale, and determinations pertaining to the requirements for claiming priority to prior filed applications.

Nevertheless, for the sake of progressing examination, Applicants have canceled Claims 1 and 30 to which the claim of priority to the provisional applications was denied.

Applicants expressly claim priority to the aforementioned U.S. provisional applications. New independent Claim 66 is based on Claim 1 as originally filed in the present application, and has been amended with express and implicit support as shown above in the present specification. In addition, the same express and implicit support for Claim 66 is in the two provisional applications to which priority is claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are entitled to the priority date of the earliest U.S. provisional application 60/458,143, filed March 27, 2003.

Objection to the Specification (Pages 4-5 of the Action)

The specification is objected to for not complying with sequence rules. Specifically, paragraph [0072] refers to nucleic acid sequences that are not accompanied by SEQ ID numbers. As the noted sequences are in the sequence listing previously filed, the specification has been amended to identify the sequence appropriately by SEQ ID NO.

Objection to the Claims (Page 5 of the Action)

The objection to Claims 1 and 30 is rendered moot by the canceling of the claims.

Claim Rejections

The pending claims have been rejected on the basis of written description, definiteness, obviousness, and double patenting. These rejections are addressed separately below.

A. Written Description Support for the Pending Claims (Pages 5-11 of the Action)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55, and 60-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims are alleged to contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, independent Claims 1 and 30, as amended, were rejected for their recitation of methods for determining if a subject "has an acute ischemic renal tubular cell injury that can progress to acute renal failure", and obtaining urine samples from a subject "within a period of time of about 12 hours after an event..."; Claim 35 was rejected for reciting a period of time "selected from the group consisting of 6 hours, 3 hours, 2 hours, 1 hour, and 30 minutes"; new Claims 63-64 were rejected for reciting a period of time "selected from the group consisting of 3 hours, 2 hours, 1 hour and 30 minutes"; new Claims 60-61 were rejected for reciting that the elevated level is "at least a 10-fold increase"; and new Claim 65 was rejected for reciting that "the elevated quantity of NGAL is significantly elevated above a smaller increased quantity of NGAL in a mammalian subject having an acute ischemic renal tubular cell injury that does not progress to ARF".

Without acquiescing to the analyses and determinations made in the rejection, and without any prejudice, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection. For the purpose of progressing the prosecution of the application, Applicants have canceled independent Claims 1 and 30, and have canceled dependent Claims 61, 63, 64 and 65, thereby rendering the rejection moot as to the specific rejections to these claims. Claim 35 has been amended to limit the group of periods of time, and Claim 60, likewise, has been amended to provide a patient population and to identify a sample as related to the at least a 10-fold increase.

B. Definiteness of the Pending Claims (Pages 12-13 of the Action)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55, and 60-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, independent Claims 1 and 30 were rejected for reciting methods "for determining if a human has an acute ischemic renal injury that can progress to acute renal failure" on the basis that it purportedly is unclear whether diagnostic or prognostic methods are intended. Claims 1 and 30 were rejected for reciting "an elevated quantity of NGAL", on the basis that it is not clear what the quantity of NGAL is elevated relative to. Also, the term "significantly elevated" in Claim 65 is alleged a relative term which renders the claim indefinite, such that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Without acquiescing to the analyses and determinations made in the rejection, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection. For the purpose of progressing the prosecution of the application, Applicants have canceled independent Claims 1 and 30, and dependent Claim 65, thereby rendering the rejection moot as to the specific rejections to these claims.

C. Nonobviousness of the Pending Claims 5, 30, 33, 35, 37, 61, 63, and 65 (Pages 13-21 of the Action)

Claims 5, 30, 33, 35, 37, 61, 63, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Matthaeus et al. ("Acute Ischemic Renal Failure Induces Expression of Neutrophil Gelatinase-Associated Lipocalin and Matrix Metalloproteinase-9 in Damaged Tubuli" *Kidney Blood Press Res* (2001), Vol. 24, page 342, abstract No. P268); hereafter, "Matthaeus 1" or Matthaeus et al. ("Co-Regulation of Neutrophil Gelatinase-Associated

Lipocalin and Matrix Metalloproteinase-9 in the Postischemic Rat Kidney" *J Am Soc Nephrol* Vol. 12, September 2001, Pathophysiology of Renal Disease, pp. 787A; A41 12, SVI-0348 (PS), Applicant's IDS of 11/13/07); hereafter, "Matthaeus 2", in view of Ramsden et al. (US 4,640,909), Blaser et al. ("A sandwich enzyme immunoassay for the determination of neutrophil lipocalin in body fluids" Clin Chim Acta. 1995 Mar 31 ;235(2): 137-45, Applicant's IDS of 7/24/06), Moses et al. (US 7,153,660 B2), and Muramatsu (Kidney International, Vol. 62 (2002), pages 1601-1610, Applicant's IDS of 10/18/04); or, in the alternative, over either Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 and Ohlsson et al. ("Increased circulating levels of proteinase 3 in patients with anti-neutrophilic cytoplasmic autoantibodies-associated systemic vasculitis in remission" Clin Exp Immunol. (available online February 28, 2003) 131 (3):528-35, see Applicant's IDS of 7/24/06) in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., and Muramatsu (Kidney International, Vol. 62 (2002), pages 1601-1610, Applicant's IDS of 10/18/04).

The Examiner rejects the claims as obvious over a combination of the above 5, or alternatively 6, references.

The rejection also states that the references Matthaeus 1/2 (and Ohlsson et al.) in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., and Moses et al., fail to specifically teach detection of NGAL "within about 12 hours". The rejection further states that the claims are rendered obvious of the aforementioned references, further in view of Muramatsu et al. The Examiner's rejection goes on to state that:

> "the reference (Muramatsu et al.) teaches screening for a biomarker of ARF (Cyr61) by detecting the presence of urinary Cyr61 within specified times in relation to the onset of induced renal ischemia, as a model of ARF.... The reference exemplifies time points of 3-6, 6-9, 9-12, 12-18, and 18-24 hours after ischemia (see especially the legend to Figure 8) and report that the levels of urinary Cyr61 were seen to increase within 3-6 hours (page 1608). The reference also teaches that no urine was produced within the first three hours, such that the first time point of 3-6 hours would represent the first urine output (legend to Figure 8). Therefore, it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to detect NGAL levels as early as possible as taught by Muramatsu, and in particular within the recited time ranges in relation to the onset of injury out of the normal desire of artisans to improve upon what is already known. See MPEP 2144.05. In particular, one would be motivated to detect NGAL within 24 hours or earlier in order to

diagnose disease earlier, and therefore to allow for timely interventions to be performed. Given that Muramatsu exemplify time points that overlap those claimed (e.g., 3-6 hours), it would have been a matter of routine optimization to determine and select."

Without acquiescing to the above rejection under 35 USC 103(a) or its basis or rationale, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the amendments to the claims, including canceling of independent Claim 30 and the addition of new independent Claim 66, and in view of the following arguments and submissions.

Applicants also incorporate herein by reference their arguments over this rejection from the response filed November 27, 2007, as well as the additional arguments presented in its response filed June 3, 2008, and provide additional remarks herein after.

New independent Claim 66 provides that the urine sample is obtained from the mammal within 4 hours of the renal tubular cell injury; and to provide correlating the level of the detected antibody-NGAL complex to the mammal having the renal tubular cell injury.

Muramatsu et al. has a publication date of November, 2002.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to the remaining claims under examination, on the ground that the Muramatsu et al. reference is not prior art against the claimed invention.

Applicants take the position that Muramatsu et al. is being asserted as prior art under 35 USC 103(a) as a 102(a) reference, having published less than one year prior to the earliest priority application pertaining to Applicants' claimed invention, namely, U.S. provisional application 60/458,143, filed March 27, 2003.

Applicants present herewith a Supplemental Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 by joint inventors Prasad Devarajan and Jonathan Barasch, that demonstrates conception, and reduction to practice, of the claimed invention in the United States, prior to the effective date of the Muramatsu reference.

The showing of facts made in the Declaration should be such, in character and weight, as to establish reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference, or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to said date to a subsequent reduction to practice or to the filing of the application. Original exhibits of

drawings or records, or photocopies thereof, must accompany and form part of the affidavit or declaration or their absence must be satisfactorily explained.

The Muramatsu et al. reference has an unspecified effective date in November, 2002.

The Supplemental 131 Declaration demonstrates the conception and reduction to practice of the invention as claimed, prior to November 1, 2002 in the United States. More specifically, the Supplemental 131 Declaration describes an experiment in the laboratory of Dr. Devarajan at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A. that showed the conception and reduction to practice of a method for detection of a renal tubular cell injury (RTCI) in a mammal, the RTCI being an ischemic renal injury. The experiment performed a surgical procedure upon the mammal known to induce renal ischemia. The experiment provided collection of a urine sample at and within five hours, including at and within four hours, of the RTCI from the affected mammal. The urine samples were assayed by western blot, where a primary antibody for NGAL was contacted with the NGAL to form a complex of the antibody and NGAL. Examination of the western blots, as shown in the photographs, enabled correlating the level of detected antibody-NGAL complex in the western blots to the mammals having the RTCI.

The Supplemental 131 Declaration establishes that the claimed invention was made prior to the effective date of the Muramatsu reference, such that the reference is not prior art against the claimed invention.

D. Nonobviousness of the Pending Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 31, 48, 55, 60, and 64 (Pages 21-23 of the Action)

Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 31, 48, 55, 60, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., and Muramatsu et al., or in the alternative over Matthaeus 1 or Mattheus 2 and Ohlsson et al. in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., and Muramatsu et al. as applied to Claims 5, 30, and 33 above, and further in view of David et al. (US 4,376,110).

Without acquiescing to the above rejection under 35 USC 103(a) or its basis or rationale, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the amendments to the claims, including canceling of independent Claim 1, and the addition of new independent Claim 66, and in view of the following arguments and submissions.

Applicants also incorporate herein by reference their arguments over this rejection from the response filed November 27, 2007, as well as the additional arguments presented in its response filed June 3, 2008, and provide additional remarks herein after.

New independent Claim 66 provides that the urine sample is obtained from the mammal within 4 hours of the renal tubular cell injury; and to provide correlating the level of the detected antibody-NGAL complex to the mammal having the renal tubular cell injury.

Muramatsu et al. has a publication date of November, 2002.

Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to the remaining claims under examination, on the ground that the Muramatsu et al. reference is not prior art against the claimed invention, as established herein above in view of the Supplemental Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 by joint inventors Prasad Devarajan and Jonathan Barasch, that demonstrates conception, and reduction to practice, of the claimed invention in the United States, prior to the effective date of the Muramatsu reference.

E. Nonobviousness of Pending Claim 2 (Pages 23-25 of the Action)

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., and Muramatsu et al., or in the alternative over Matthaeus 1 or Mattheus 2 and Ohlsson et al. in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., and Muramatsu et al., and further in view of Valkers or Linzer et al.

Without acquiescing to the above rejection under 35 USC 103(a) or its basis or rationale, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the amendments to the claims, on the ground that the Muramatsu et al. reference is not prior art against the claimed invention, as established herein above in view of the Supplemental Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 by joint inventors Prasad Devarajan and Jonathan Barasch, that demonstrates conception, and reduction to practice, of the claimed invention in the United States, prior to the effective date of the Muramatsu reference.

F. Nonobviousness of Pending Claims 48 and 55 (Pages 25-26 of the Action)

Claims 48 and 55 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., Muramatsu et al., and David et al., or in the alternative, Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 and Ohlsson et al. in view of Ramsden et

al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., Muramatsu et al., and David et al. -- and further in view of Kosako et al.

Claim 48 is canceled.

Without acquiescing to the above rejection under 35 USC 103(a) or its basis or rationale, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the amendments to the claims, on the ground that the Muramatsu et al. reference is not prior art against the claimed invention, as established herein above in view of the Supplemental Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 by joint inventors Prasad Devarajan and Jonathan Barasch, that demonstrates conception, and reduction to practice, of the claimed invention in the United States, prior to the effective date of the Muramatsu reference.

G. Nonobviousness of Pending Claim 52 (Page 26 of the Action)

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al. and Moses et al., or in the alternative, Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 and Ohlsson et al. in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., and Moses et al., -- and further in view of Brady et al.

Without acquiescing to the above rejection under 35 USC 103(a) or its basis or rationale, the rejection is rendered moot in view of the cancelation of Claim 52.

H. Nonobviousness of Pending Claim 62 (Pages 26-27 of the Action)

Claim 62 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., Moses et al., Muramatsu et al., and David et al., or in the alternative, Matthaeus 1 or Matthaeus 2 and Ohlsson et al. in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al., and Moses et al., Muramatsu et al., and David et al. -- and further in view of Brady et al.

Without acquiescing to the above rejection under 35 USC 103(a) or its basis or rationale, the rejection is rendered moot in view of the cancelation of Claim 62.

I. Double Patenting (Pages 27-32)

(i) Co-pending Application No. 11/096,113 (Attorney Docket CHM-025M)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55 and 60-65 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over the claims 2, 4, 7-10 and 22-39 of co-pending Application No. 11/096,113 (Applicants' commonly-owned, co-pending application, Attorney Docket CHM-025M), in view of Ramsden et al., Blaser et al. and Moses et al. Co-pending Application No. 11/096,113 has claims related to detecting NGAL in a sample of blood to identify if the subject is predisposed to progressing to acute renal failure as a result of an acute renal tubular cell injury.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection, for the following reasons.

MPEP 804 states: "A rejection based on nonstatutory double patenting is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the right to exclude granted by a patent... and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. Where the claims of an application are not the "same" as those of a first patent, but the grant of a patent with the claims in the application would unjustly extend the rights granted by the first patent, a double patenting rejection under non-statutory grounds is proper.

It is respectfully noted that each and every claim of the present invention requires a "urine sample", while each and every claim of the co-pending application 11/096,113 requires a sample isolated from the blood, including a blood serum sample. Consequently, the claims of these applications cannot be the "same" invention, because there cannot be overlapping of the scope of the claims, and there cannot be any unjustly extending of the rights granted in a first patent issued to one of the applications, by the granting of the second application. The circumstances described in *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968), are not applicable in the present circumstances.

The Examiner is reminded that neither the present application nor the reference co-pending application 11/096,113 have issued as a patent, and the present application has a filing date that precedes the earliest priority date and filing date of the co-pending application 11/096,113.

(ii) Co-pending Application No. 11/770,422 (Attorney Docket CHM-015C)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55 and 60-65 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over the claims 30-31, 33-45 and 47-50 of co-pending Application No. 11/770,422 (Applicants' commonly-owned, co-pending application, Attorney Docket CHM-015C), in view of David et al. Co-pending Application No. 11/770,422 is a continuation of the present application.

Applicants preserve the right to file a Terminal Disclaimer in the later of the present application and the reference Application No. 11/770,422 that has allowed claims.

(iii) Co-pending Application No. 11/770,372 (Attorney Docket CHM-025MC)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55 and 60-65 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over the claims 30-31, 33-45 and 47-50 of co-pending Application No. 11/770,372 (Applicants' commonly-owned, co-pending application, Attorney Docket CHM-025MC), in view of David et al., Ramsden et al., Blaser et al. and Moses et al.

Co-pending Application No. 11/770,372 is a continuation of Application No. 11/096,113 (Attorney Docket CHM-025M) discussed above.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection, for the reasons stated above.

MPEP 804 states: "A rejection based on nonstatutory double patenting is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the right to exclude granted by a patent. Where the claims of an application are not the "same" as those of a first patent, but the grant of a patent with the claims in the application would unjustly extend the rights granted by the first patent, a double patenting rejection under non-statutory grounds is proper.

It is respectfully noted that each and every claim of the present invention requires a "urine sample", while each and every claim of the co-pending application 11/770/372 requires a sample isolated from the blood, including a blood serum sample. Consequently, the claims of these applications cannot be the "same" invention, because there cannot be overlapping of the scope of the claims, and there cannot be any unjustly extending of the rights granted in a first patent issued to one of the applications, by the granting of the second application. The

circumstances described in *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968), are not applicable in the present circumstances.

The Examiner is reminded that neither the present application nor the reference co-pending application 11/770/372 have issued as a patent, and the present application has a filing date that precedes the earliest priority date and filing date of the co-pending application 11/770/372.

(iv) Co-pending Application No. 11/770,214 (Attorney Docket CHM-032A3)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55 and 60-65 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over the claims 29-30, 32-44 and 46-49 of co-pending Application No. 11/770,214 (commonly-owned, co-pending application, Attorney Docket CHM-032A3), in view of David et al. Co-pending Application No. 11/770,214 has claims related to detecting NGAL in a sample of urine obtained from a subject having a chronic renal injury.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the provisional restriction requirement, on the basis that the claims of the present application are drawn to acute renal tubular cell injuries, whereas the claims of the reference application 11/770,214 are drawn to chronic renal tubular cell injuries. The acute and chronic injuries are generally caused by different types of events or diseases, and the Examiner has not identified any reference or line of reasoning which would demonstrate to a person of ordinary skill in the art that an effective biomarker for acute renal tubular cell injury would also be an effective biomarker for chronic renal tubular cell injury.

In any event, Applicants preserve the right to file a Terminal Disclaimer in the later of the present application and the reference Application No. 11/770,214 that has allowed claims.

(v) Co-pending Application No. 11/770,245 (Attorney Docket CHM-032B3)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 48, 52, 55 and 60-65 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over the claims 29, 31-43 and 45-49 of co-pending Application No. 11/770,245 (Applicants' commonly-owned, co-pending

application, Attorney Docket CHM-032B3), in view of David et al., Ramsden et al., Blaser et al. and Moses et al.

Applicants preserve the right to file a Terminal Disclaimer in the later of the present application and the reference Application No. 11/770,245 that has allowed claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe a full and complete response to the Action has been made, and that the claims are patentable over the prior art of reference. Applicants request a prompt notice of allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

For: Prasad DEVARAJAN et al.

By _____

Daniel F. Nesbitt
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,746
(513) 229-0383
Customer Number 38155

March 4, 2009